



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	David L. Henty	DLH1.PAU.02	8707
10/003,778	10/31/2001	David E. Helly	EXAM	INER
7590 04/21/2004			KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
David L. Henty Suite 1150 19900 MacArthur Blvd. Irvine, CA 92612			2675 DATE MAILED: 04/21/200	PAPER NUMBER  6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/003,778	HENTY, DAVID L.				
omeened cammany	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this comm	Srilakshmi K. Kumar unication appears on the cover sheet v	2675				
Period for Reply	unioudon appears on the cover sneet	vial die correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisic after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for re Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	INICATION. ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a mmunication. y (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of th a statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC ply will, by statute, cause the application to become A is after the mailing date of this communication, even	a reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s)	filed on December 8, 2004					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .						
3)☐ Since this application is in condition	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the	e application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is	/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to rest	riction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	ejection to the drawing(s) be held in abeya					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) includi	ng the correction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊡ Acknowledgment is made of a clair	m for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
<u> </u>	ty documents have been received.					
	ty documents have been received in a	Application No.				
	es of the priority documents have been					
	tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	· ·				
* See the attached detailed Office act	tion for a list of the certified copies no	t received.				
Attachment(s)	<b>.</b> □	Summers (DTO 442)				
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review</li> </ol>		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2675

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al (US 6,445,379) in view of Gershenfeld et al (US 6,025,725).

As to independent claims 1, 8 and 9, Liu et al disclose a wireless mouse and reader combination (Fig. 1), comprising; a source of an interrogating field (Fig. 1, item 12); a wireless mouse having a movable XY encoder (Fig. 1, item 20), a plurality of mouse control buttons (Fig. 1, on the top of the upper housing, 21, there are a plurality of buttons), at least one antenna (col. 2, lines 32-37), and one or more transponder circuits coupled to the at least one antenna and associated with XY encoder and plurality of mouse control buttons and providing a response to the interrogating field identifying XY encoder motion and mouse control button activation; and a reader including a decoder for determining the response from the passive transponder circuits (col. 2, lines 24-54). Liu et al does not disclose where the transponder circuits are passive transponder circuits. Gershenfeld et al disclose a system for remotely sensing including coils made with magnetic materials as is disclosed in col. 6, lines 30-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Liu and Gershenfeld as the system of Gershenfeld would be typical of the transponders used. Further, Gershenfled disclose in col. 3, lines 25-31, where this system would be used in a wireless computer input device.

Art Unit: 2675

As to dependent claim 2, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, wherein said XY encoder comprises a ball (Fig. 1, item 23) adapted to rotate in response to mouse motion and X and Y encoder wheels coupled to the ball so as to respectively rotate in response to mouse motion in perpendicular directions (Fig. 1, on either side of where the ball is housed).

As to dependent claims 3 and 10, limitations of claims 2 and 9, and further comprising, wherein said XY encoder wheels further comprise a circuit element coupled to said one or more passive transponder circuits so as to tune and detune said one or more passive transponder circuits in response to mouse motion in X and Y directions (col. 2, lines 55-57).

As to dependent claim 4, limitations of claim 3, and further comprising, wherein said circuit element comprises a circuit element magnetically coupled to said one or more passive transponder circuits. Liu et al does not disclose where the transponder circuits are passive transponder circuits. Gershenfeld et al disclose a system for remotely sensing including coils made with magnetic materials as is disclosed in col. 6, lines 30-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Liu and Gershenfeld as the system of Gershenfeld would be typical of the transponders used. Further, Gershenfled disclose in col. 3, lines 25-31, where this system would be used in a wireless computer input device.

As to dependent claim 5, limitations of claim 3, and further comprising, wherein said circuit element comprises a circuit element capacitively coupled to said one or more passive transponder circuits. Liu et al does not disclose where the transponder circuits are passive transponder circuits. Gershenfeld et al disclose a system for remotely sensing including coils made with magnetic and capacitative material as is disclosed in col. 6, lines 30-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Liu and Gershenfeld as the

Art Unit: 2675

system of Gershenfeld would be typical of the transponders used. Further, Gershenfled disclose in col. 3, lines 25-31, where this system would be used in a wireless computer input device.

As to dependent claims 6 and 11, limitations of claims 1 and 9, and further comprising, wherein said interrogating field includes first and second frequencies and wherein said one or more passive transponder circuits resonant at said first and second frequencies, respectively (col. 4, lines 25-47).

As to dependent claims 7 and 12, limitations of claims 6 and 9, and further comprising, wherein said at least one antenna comprises first and second antennas respectively coupled to said first and second passive transponder circuits (col. 4, lines 25-47).

## Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 8, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues there is no reason to combine Liu with Gershenfeld. Examiner disagrees. The prior art, Gershenfeld et al disclose in col. 1, where the transponder relates to remotely sensing and monitoring various conditions to which objects are subject in particular using planar electromagnetic resonator packages. In col. 2, lines 60-67, Gershenfeld, two or more resonators are used on the same structure to monitor various conditions in the same environment. Further, Gershenfeld discloses in col. 3, lines 1-10, where resonators can be used to monitor physically in semiconductor chips or other electronic components. In still another aspect, differently characterized resonators are used to encode binary information. The invention may be used in a variety of practical applications including use as a wireless computer input device. Gershenfeld et al disclose a system for remotely sensing including coils made with

Art Unit: 2675

magnetic materials as is disclosed in col. 6, lines 30-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Liu and Gershenfeld as the system of Gershenfeld would be typical of the transponders used.

### Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srilakshmi K. Kumar whose telephone number is 703 306 5575.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven J. Saras can be reached on 703 305 9720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Srilakshmi K. Kumar Examiner Art Unit 2675

SKK April 17, 2004

> DENNIS-DOON CHOW PRIMARY EXAMINER